



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,644	12/29/2000	Pankaj Kedia	P10226	1491
7590	04/13/2006		EXAMINER	
Stephen T. Neal Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP Seventh Floor 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026			CHEN, TSE W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	
			DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/752,644	KEDIA ET AL.	
	Examiner Tse Chen	Art Unit 2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 29-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 29-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Amendment dated March 8, 2006.
2. Claims 29-56 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 51-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant did not disclose the subject matter of "the processor providing access to a computer system when the computer system [is] in a low power mode in response to verbal instructions from the speech recognition unit". Therefore, said subject matters are considered new and are not eligible for prosecution in this application.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant did not disclose the particular version or operating class associated with the BLUETOOTH trademark. Examiner submits that different BLUETOOTH versions or

operating classes inherently have different characteristics [e.g., specific profile elements] that would affect the scope of the claims. To proceed with prosecution, Examiner will assume the version to be 1.0.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 34 is objected to because of the following informalities: the use of the trademark BLUETOOTH should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 29, 33, 36-38, 43-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, US Patent 5983073, in view of Kim, US Patent 6044473 and White, US Patent 6594632.

10. In re claim 29, Ditzik discloses a method comprising:

- Transitioning a CPU [38] of a computer system [100] into a power mode [80], the computer system having a computer system memory [40] [col. 9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col. 13, ll.1-30; wireless data communication mode 80 operates with closed configuration].

Art Unit: 2116

- Activating a low power subsystem [14] that is independent of the CPU when the CPU transitions into the power mode [80 associated with closed configuration] [col.8, ll.4-58; col.9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col.13, ll.1-30].
- Receiving verbal instructions from a user through a wireless set [14c], the wireless set being coupled to the low power subsystem though a wireless interface [inherently, a wireless interface in the broadest interpretation is needed to transform the verbal to cdma signals for communication] of the low power subsystem [col.8, ll.4-58; col.9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col.11, ll.37-46; col.13, ll.1-30].
- Independent of the CPU, interpreting the verbal instructions from the user at a unit of the low power subsystem [inherently, a unit is needed to interpret the verbal to cdma signals for communication] [col.8, ll.4-58; col.9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col.11, ll.37-46].
- Independent of the CPU and in response to instructions [commands], accessing data contained within the computer system memory [bi-directional communication] using a processor [inherently, some processor in the broadest interpretation is needed in order to process data communication] of the low power subsystem [col.8, ll.4-58; col.9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col.13, ll.1-30; user interacts with 14 independent of 38 to access data].

11. Ditzik did not disclose explicitly that the power mode associated with closed configuration is a low-power mode and did not discuss details of the verbal instructions.

12. Kim discloses transitioning a CPU of a computer system [portable notebook computer] into a low-power mode [sleep mode associated with CPU in closed configuration] [col.1, ll.23-41].

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ditzik and Kim before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the computer system taught by Ditzik to include the very well known low-power mode taught by Kim, in order to obtain the claimed apparatus. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to reduce power consumption [Kim: col.1, ll.23-41; col.2, l.66 – col.3, l.3; computer system transitions CPU to sleep mode to reduce power consumption when in closed configuration since computer system functions are not being used].

14. White discloses a method comprising:

- Receiving verbal instructions from a user through a wireless headset [operator headset] [fig.2].
- Interpreting the verbal instructions from the user at a speech recognition unit [voice recognition system] [col.2, ll.12-16].
- In response to the verbal instructions, accessing data [plu inquiry] contained within a computer system memory [pos system] [col.2, ll.12-16].

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ditzik and White before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the low power subsystem taught by Ditzik to include the wireless headset with speech recognition capability teachings of White, in order to obtain the claimed method. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to perform hands-free operation such as information query using human speech or other means [White: col.1, l.5 – col.2, l.67].

Art Unit: 2116

16. As to claim 33, Ditzik discloses, comprising accessing data from a network [external wide area communications network] via the external interface of the low-power subsystem [14] [col.5, ll.52-59].

17. As to claim 36, Ditzik discloses, comprising presenting the data accessed to a user via a display [fig.3c] of the low power subsystem [col.13, ll.24-30; display graphics].

18. As to claim 37, White discloses, comprising presenting the data accessed to a user via an audio output [speaker] of the wireless headset [col.4, ll.13-26].

19. In re claim 38, Ditzik, Kim, and White disclose each and every limitation as discussed above in reference to claim 29. Ditzik, Kim, and White disclose the method of operating the apparatus comprising a computer system and a low power subsystem; therefore, Ditzik, Kim, and White disclose the apparatus.

20. As to claim 43, Ditzik discloses, wherein the wireless interface [e.g., cdma] of the low power subsystem connects with a local area network [col.5, ll.52-59; col.8, ll.4-58].

21. As to claim 44, Ditzik discloses, wherein the low power subsystem comprises a video display [fig.3c] to display data accessed from the computer system [col.13, ll.24-30; display graphics].

22. As to claim 45, White discloses, comprising receiving commands at the computer system through the wireless interface as verbal instructions [fig.2; col.2, ll.12-16; col.2, ll.12-16].

23. As to claim 46, White discloses, comprising presenting the data [plu] accessed from the computer system [pos] through an audio headset [operator headset] as audio data transmitted from a wireless interface [operating on wireless transceiver] [col.4, ll.13-26].

Art Unit: 2116

- 24. As to claim 47, Ditzik discloses, comprising sending the data accessed from the computer system to a cellular phone [fig. 7; col.5, ll.52-59; col.8, ll.4-58; col.9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col.13, ll.1-30; col.12, ll.50-67; data is relayed to computer system and then accessed by the cellular phone in a two way communication].
- 25. As to claim 48, Ditzik discloses, wherein the computer system comprises a main screen [4] and the low power subsystem comprises a miniature display screen [fig.3c] and wherein the miniature display screen is activated when the main screen is closed [col.8, ll.4-58; col.9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col.13, ll.1-30].
- 26. As to claim 49, Ditzik discloses, wherein the computer system comprises stored multimedia data [e.g., graphics], wherein the low power subsystem accesses the stored multimedia data and wherein the low power subsystem presents the multimedia data to a user through the wireless interface [col.13, ll.24-30; data is presented through the use of cdma].
- 27. As to claim 50, Ditzik discloses, wherein the low power subsystem presents the multimedia data to the user over a miniature display screen [fig.3c] of the low power subsystem [col.13, ll.24-30; e.g., display graphics on screen].
- 28. Claims 30-32, 39-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, Kim, and White as applied to claims 29, 38 above, and further in view of Kableshkov, US Patent 6108663.
- 29. Ditzik, Kim, and White taught each and every limitation as discussed above in reference to claims 29, 38. Ditzik, Kim, and White did not discuss the details of accessing data.
- 30. In re claim 30, Kabelshkov discloses a method wherein accessing data comprises accessing data through a shared database [relational database of 31], the method further

comprising storing at least a partial copy of data accessed from a computer system [10] memory [34] in the shared database [col.4, ll.36-61].

31. In re claim 39, Kabelshkov discloses a low-power subsystem [30] accesses the computer system [10] through a shared database [relational database of 31] [col.4, ll.36-61].

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ditzik, Kim, White and Kabelshkov before him at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Kabelshkov as the shared database taught by Kabelshkov is well known to be suitable for use in the system of Ditzik, Kim, and White. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides an efficient way to access data [Kabelshkov: col.4, ll.50-56].

33. As to claim 31, Kabelshkov discloses, wherein the computer system memory comprises a disk drive unit [34] [col.4, ll.36-61].

34. As to claims 32 and 42, Ditzik discloses, wherein the data contained in the shared database includes multimedia data [col.1, ll.8-17].

35. As to claim 40, Ditzik discloses, wherein the computer system [fig.7] comprises:

- A CPU [38].
- A memory device [40] couple to the CPU.
- A disk drive unit [42] couple to the CPU.

36. As to claim 41, Kabelshkov discloses wherein the shared database is coupled to the disk drive unit [fig.2], the shared database to store at least a partial copy of data stored on the disk drive unit [col.4, ll.36-61].

Art Unit: 2116

37. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, Kim, and White as applied to claim 29 above, and further in view of Maruyama et al., U.S. Patent 6760074, hereinafter Maruyama.

38. Ditzik, Kim, and White taught each and every limitation as discussed above in reference to claims 29. Ditzik, Kim, and White did not disclose explicitly using BLUETOOTH.

39. Maruyama discloses a wireless [phs] comprising BLUETOOTH communicating with the low power subsystem through a BLUETOOTH interface of the wireless interface [col.10, l.54 – col.11, l.23].

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Ditzik, Kim, White and Maruyama before him at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teachings of Maruyama as the BLUETOOTH [version 1.0] is well known to be suitable for use with the headset taught by White. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to communicate with a wide variety of devices.

41. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ditzik, Kim, and White as applied to claims 33 above, and further in view of Chen et al., U.S. Patent 5590197, hereinafter Chen.

42. Ditzik, Kim, and White disclose every limitation as discussed above in reference to claim 33. Ditzik, Kim, and White did not disclose explicitly the network being an electronic store.

43. Chen discloses a network [fig.1] as an electronic store [merchant processor] allowing an electronic purchase [col.4, ll.46-50].

44. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Chen, Ditzik, Kim, and White before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the

system as taught by Ditzik, Kim, and White to include the network as taught by Chen, in order to obtain an electronic store allowing an electronic purchase. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a way to extend the computer system's capabilities [Ditzik: col.2, l.33 - col.3, l.22].

Response to Arguments

45. Applicant's arguments filed March 8, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

46. Applicant asserts that the subject matter of "the processor providing access to a computer system when the computer system [is] in a low power mode in response to verbal instructions from the speech recognition unit" in claim 51 is disclosed in the sections cited on pp.8-9 of the Remarks dated March 8, 2006. Examiner disagrees as the sections cited do not support verbal commands to transition the computer system to a low power mode.

47. Applicant alleges that Ditzik does not show that "the cellular telephone can be used to access any data in the notebook computer memory... independent of the CPU or when the CPU is in a low power mode". Examiner disagrees and submits that Ditzik does disclose accessing the data independent of the CPU in the notebook [col.8, ll.4-58; col.9, l.55 – col. 10, l.10; col.13, ll.1-30; user interacts with 14 independent of 38 to access data]. Ditzik did not explicitly require the user to access the data in the notebook computer memory through the CPU instead of the cellular telephone [i.e., access data to be dependent of the CPU cannot be found in the disclosure].

48. As such, Applicant's arguments are deemed not persuasive and the rejections are respectfully maintained.

Conclusion

49. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tse Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2116

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tse Chen
March 18, 2006


LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100